APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/865,287	05/25/2001	David C. Tracey	2079.003200	5166

7590 12/02/2003	EXAMINER
BRIAN M. BERLINER ESQ.	MOSLEHI, FARHOOD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2126	

BRIAN M. BERLINER ESQ.
O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
400 SOUTH HOPE STREET
LOS ANGELES, CA 90071-2899

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/865,287	TRACEY, DAVID C.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Farhood Moslehi	2126

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _____ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *25 May 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-59* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-59* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application)
since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet.
37 CFR 1.78.

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific
reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-59 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3.   Claims 1,6,9,14,17,22,27,32,36-39,41-43,46,48-51,53,54,55,58 are rejected

under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stucka et al. (5,596,702) (hereinafter

Stucka).

4.   As per claim 1, Stucka teaches a method for supplanting a Motif dialog box,

comprising: interposing a functionality between a graphical interface of an application

and an Xt Library layered on top an X-Window system (e.g. col. 19, lines 54-60);

Intercepting a function call from the graphical interface for a display of a Motif dialog box

from the X-Window system (e.g. col. 9, lines 13-17); Determining whether the Motif

dialog box is to be supplanted; and supplanting the Motif dialog box (e.g. col. 23, lines

38-45).

5.   As per claim 9, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

6.   As per claim 17, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

7.   As per claim 27, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

8.   As per claim 36, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

9.   As per claim 48, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

10.   As per claim 6, Stucka teaches the method wherein supplanting the Motif dialog

box includes: calling a callback function (e.g. col. 6,7, lines 65-67 and 1-13

respectively); or suppressing the Motif dialog box (e.g. col. 17, lines 35-45).

11.   As per claim 14, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

12.   As per claim 22, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

13.   As per claim 32, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

14.   As per claim 46, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

15.   As per claim 58, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

16.   As per claim 37, Stucka shows the computing system, wherein the computing

system comprises a single computing device (Figure 2).

17.   As per claim 49, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

18.   As per claim 38, Stucka shows the computing system, wherein the computing

system comprises a plurality of computing devices (Figure 1, Prior Art).

19.   As per claim 50, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

20.   As per claim 39, Stucka shows the computing system, wherein the application

resides on a first one of the plurality of computing devices and at least one of the X-

Window system, the Xt library, and the interposed library reside on a second one of the

plurality of computing devices (Figure 1, Prior Art).

21.   As per claim 51, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

22.   As per claim 41, Stucka shows the computing system, wherein the graphical

interface is a Motif graphical interface (e.g. col. 2, lines 43-51).

23.　As per claim 53, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

24.　As per claim 42, Stucka demonstrates the computing system wherein the original function is an original XtManageChild() function (e.g. col. 26, lines 45-55). The hierarchy and the management of parent-child component relationship is demonstrated through examples.

25.　As per claim as per claim 54, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

26.　As per claim 43, Stucka demonstrates a computing system wherein the interposed function is an interposed XtManageChild() function (e.g. col. 14-15, Table I).

27.　As per claim 55, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

28.　The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

29.　Claim 2,3,10,11,18,19, 28,29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stucka in view of Jones et al. (6,118,446) (hereinafter Jones).

30.　As per claim 2, Stucka does not specifically teach the method wherein intercepting the function call includes calling the interposed function corresponding to an original function. Jones shows the method wherein intercepting the function call includes calling the interposed function corresponding to an original function (e.g. col. 9, lines 1-18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine Stucka with Jones. The motivation would have been to

override an intercepted function in order to use the same function names repeatedly.

31.   As per claim 10, it is rejected for the similar reasons as stated above.

32.   As per claim 18, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

33.   As per claim 28, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

34.   As per claim 3, Stucka does not specifically teach the method, further comprising

redirecting an operating system from the original function to the interposed function.

Jones teaches the method, further comprising redirecting an operating system from the

original function to the interposed function (e.g. col. 9, lines 1-25). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine

Stucka with Jones. The motivation would have been to redirect the operating system to

perform the needed task such as the creating a new display with specific widgets.

35.   As per claim 11, it is rejected for the similar reasons as stated above.

36.   As per claim 19, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

37.   As per claim 29, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

38.   Claims 4,5,7,8,12,13,15,16,20,21,23,24,30,31,33-35,44,45,47,56,57,59 are

rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stucka in view of Parker et

al. (5,600,789) (hereinafter Parker).

39.   As per claim 4, Stucka does not specifically show the method wherein

determining whether the Motif dialog box is to be supplanted includes: Calling a naming

function to identify the Motif dialog box in the intercepted call; and comparing the name

returned by the naming function against a plurality of Motif dialog box names that are to

be supplanted. Parker teaches the method wherein determining whether the Motif

dialog box is to be supplanted includes: Calling a naming function to identify the Motif

dialog box in the intercepted call (e.g. col. 12, lines 40-54); and comparing the name

returned by the naming function against a plurality of Motif dialog box names that are to

be supplanted (e.g. col. 13, lines 20-31). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Stucka with Parker. The

motivation would have been to pass new parameters to the intercepted function call in

order for the object to have a different look and feel.

40.   As per claim 12 it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

41.   As per claim 8, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

42.   As per claim 16, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

43.   As per claim 20, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

44.   As per claim 23, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

45.   As per claim 30, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

46.   As per claim 33, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

47.   As per claim 35, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

48.   As per claim 44, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

49.   As per claim 56, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

50.   As per claim 5, Stucka does not specifically show the method wherein

supplanting the Motif dialog box includes: modifying at least one parameter in the

intercepted call; re-calling the display of the Motif dialog box with modified parameter;

and displaying a modified Motif dialog box. Parker shows the method wherein

supplanting the Motif dialog box includes: modifying at least one parameter in the

intercepted call (e.g. col. 24, lines 10-20); re-calling the display of the Motif dialog box

with modified parameter (e.g. col. 10, lines 2-20); and displaying a modified Motif dialog

box (e.g. col. 10, lines 2-20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made to combine Stucka with Parker. The motivation

would have been to alter the dialog box on a Motif platform based on a new parameter

set.

51.   As per claim 13, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

52.   As per claim 21, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

53.   As per claim 31, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

54.   As per claim 45, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

55.   As per claim 57, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

56.   As per claim 7, Parker shows the method wherein, upon determining whether the

Motif dialog box is to be supplanted, the method includes:

If the Motif dialog box is to be modified:

> Modify at least one parameter in the intercepted call (e.g. col. 24, lines 10-20);
>
> Re-calling the display of the Motif dialog box with the modified parameter (e.g.
>
> col. 10, lines 2-20); and displaying a modified Motif dialog box (e.g. col. 10, lines
>
> 2-20);

But Parker does not specifically show a method wherein if the Motif dialog box is to be

suppressed: calling a callback function; and suppressing the Motif dialog box. Stucka

shows a method wherein if the Motif dialog box is to be suppressed: calling a callback

function (e.g. col. 6,7, lines 65-67 and 1-13 respectively); and suppressing the Motif

dialog box (e.g. col. 17, lines 35-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill

in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Stucka with Parker. The

motivation would have been to intercept operating system widget function calls in order

to control how certain widgets (dialog boxes) are to be displayed.

57.   As per claim 15, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

58.   As per claim 24, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

59.   As per claim 34, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

60.   As per claim 47, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

61.   As per claim 59, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

62.   Claims 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Stucka in view of Parker and in further view of Jones.

63.   As per claim 25, Stucka combined with parker show the programmed computing

device, wherein, upon determining whether the Motif dialog box is to be supplanted, the

programmed method includes:

If the Motif dialog is to be modified:

Modifying at least one parameter in the intercepted call;

Re-calling the display of the Motif dialog box with the modified parameter; and

displaying a modified Motif dialog box; or

If the Motif dialog box is to be suppressed:

Calling a callback function; and

Suppressing the Motif dialog box.

Stucka even when combined with Parker do not specifically show the programmed

computing device, wherein intercepting the function call in the programmed method

includes calling an interposed function corresponding to an original function. Jones

shows the programmed computing device, wherein intercepting the function call in the

programmed method includes calling an interposed function corresponding to an

original function (e.g. col 9, lines 1-18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skills in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Stucka, Parker and

Jones. The motivation would have been to override an intercepted function in order to

use the same function names repeatedly.

64.   As per claim 26, Stucka combined with parker show the programmed computing

device, wherein, upon determining whether the Motif dialog box is to be supplanted, the

programmed method includes:

 If the Motif dialog is to be modified:

 Modifying at least one parameter in the intercepted call;

 Re-calling the display of the Motif dialog box with the modified parameter; and

 displaying a modified Motif dialog box; or

 If the Motif dialog box is to be suppressed:

 Calling a callback function; and

 Suppressing the Motif dialog box.

Stucka even when combined with Parker do not specifically show the programmed

device, wherein the programmed method further comprises redirecting an operating

system from the original function to the interposed function. Jones shows the

programmed device, wherein the programmed method further comprises redirecting an operating system from the original function to the interposed function (e.g. col. 9, lines 1-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Stucka, Parker and Jones. The motivation would have been to redirect the operating system to perform the needed task such as creating a new display with specific widgets.

65.   Claims 40,52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stucka in view of John Kacur (Red Hat Motif 2.1 for Linux, www.linuxjournal.com, May 01, 1999) (hereinafter Kacur).

66.   As per claim 40, Stucka does not specifically show the computing system wherein the application is either a Netscape Navigator application or an Adobe Acrobat reader application. Kacur shows the computing system wherein the application is a Netscape Navigator (e.g. page 1, paragraph 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Stucka with Kacur. The motivation would have been to show that commonly popular applications using Motif widgets run on the system.

67.   As per claim 52, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Farhood Moslehi whose telephone number is 703-305-8646. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 703-305-8498. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-

5484.

fm

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100